UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Is Labor More Human Than the Church?
- - - - - - - - *Kermit Eby*

Wanted: A West Point for Peace Leadership
- - - - - - *Sylvanus M. Duvall*

How Safe Are Sanctions? - *O. A. Hammand*

Fatherless Families - - *Ethel S. Beer*

"S. O. Levinson and the Pact of Paris"
Reviewed by Edwin T. Buehrer

VOLUME CXXIX NUMBER 4

Chicago, June, 1943

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of The Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor in George Williams College, Chicago.

Kermit Eby: Former Executive Secretary of the Chicago Teachers Union.

O. A. Hammand: Attorney at Law.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 51
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 54

ARTICLES—

Is Labor More Human Than the Church?—KERMIT EBY 54
Wanted: A West Point for Peace Leadership—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 56
How Safe Are Sanctions?—O. A. HAMMAND 57
Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago 58
Fatherless Families—ETHEL S. BEER 60

POETRY—

Of Truth—MADELINE MULVEY 53
Isaiah's Vision—RONALD EYRICH 59

THE STUDY TABLE—

When War Was Outlawed—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 62
Meditations—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 63

CORRESPONDENCE—

An Open Letter to Robert Maynard Hutchins—VICTOR S. YARROS 63
Thoughts on India—PETER BOIKE 63
Humanism and Ethical Culture—W. EDWIN COLLIER and EDWIN H. WILSON 64
The Problem of Social Control—L. J. CARR and JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 64

THE FIELD—

Food for Children in Occupied Countries 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Food for Children in Occupied Countries

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by a group of citizens of Chicago at a meeting held on the evening of March 5, at 77 West Washington Street.

WHEREAS the food supplies of nations allied to us in the cause of democracy are dangerously exhausted; and

WHEREAS starvation has already begun, and disease is rampant, especially among the children; and

WHEREAS no relief can be brought to them unless there be international action through which their native supplies can be protected and imports be made through the blockade; and

WHEREAS a stable peace is threatened by the physical and psychical effects of starvation, especially the starvation of the coming generation; and

WHEREAS there are large food surpluses available in South America; and many of the invaded countries have money with which to purchase the food needed to keep their people alive and have signified their desire to use funds for that purpose; and the Swedish government has ships not available to the Allies which could be used for transportation; and

WHEREAS a plan of relief has been adopted in respect to Greece which indicates that agreements among belligerent nations are entirely practicable to permit the sending of food to the hungry children of conquered nations; and to rigidly protect and safeguard food supplies for the children;

RESOLVED: We here assembled respectfully urge the Government of the United States to take the leadership in helping to secure such agreements among the nations so that the children of conquered countries may be fed before it is too late; and

RESOLVED, That the President of the United States and the Director of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation in the State Department be urged to take the necessary steps to coöperate promptly with the British, Swedish, Swiss, and other governments to work out a humanitarian program for the feeding of the children of occupied countries; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the invading nations.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIX JUNE, 1943 No. 4

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

For the lifting of our hearts I publish here the Minutes adopted by Yearly Meetings of the Friends in regard to the ending of this war. The Friends feel a "concern" about this war, the horrors it is imposing upon mankind, and in the fine tradition of their noble body, they give expression to this "concern." Thus, at the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting (Race Street) on March 30th last, the following Minute was adopted.

> The Quaker faith in the universal responsiveness of men to good will enables us to declare that it is never too late to apply reasonableness and reconciling love to any human problem. In the present war situation, we can best express this faith by urging an immediate peace based on mutual concessions in the cause of international justice. To this end we declare to our government and to our fellow citizens that an immediate-peace-by-consultation can be made morally better and more permanent than any peace which might be won by continuing the war. We urge that peace aims be redefined, giving special emphasis to the contributions which the United States is prepared to make to the cause of international justice, and that these be offered to the world as the basis for an immediate peace conference.

Echoing and reaffirming this resolution was a Minute passed by the Fourth and Arch Street Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia and Vicinity, duly adopted on April 2nd last, as follows:

> In the love of God as revealed in Christ, we declare it to be our considered purpose to humbly seek now to hasten the ending of this present war. In doing so we intend only to use the weapons of integrity, reason, patience, and love. In the execution of this task, first we must repent and accept for ourselves the sacrifices of national prestige, wealth, and standard of living which are required to attain the goal that we believe all men desire so devoutly, a just and lasting peace.

There is nothing to be added to these statements which prove that, in the face of the temptations and trials of this hour, the Quakers are steadfastly maintaining the heroic traditions of their faith, and contributing immeasurably to the only wisdom which can save us in this dread hour. If the world does not give heed to such counsels, it will not be the Quakers' fault; but will mark perhaps the final disaster of our place and time in history.

II

If Britain expected any aid and comfort from the Moslems in India, as over against the Hindus, her expectation was rudely blasted by the meetings in late April of the All-India Moslem League and all that has happened since. The Moslems, to be sure, are as much opposed to the Congress as ever. The leadership of the League is an irreconcilable leadership—but as irreconcilable with the Empire as with Gandhi and the Congress. The break here is so absolute as to raise the serious question as to the Moslems' support of the present war, and to call forth the accusation that the League is now a full-fledged "revolutionary" movement. And this is no non-violent movement, for the Moslems are making loud boast of their belief in violence. "Strife, bloodshed and misery" is the burden of their threat. What this all means is disaster for British rule and collapse of present British policy. For decades the British principle in India, as in Palestine and formerly in Ireland, has been "divide and rule." In late years, with the growing power of the All-India Congress under Gandhi's leadership, the Empire has more and more turned to the Moslems as "a very present help in time of trouble." Playing the Moslem minority over against the Hindu majority has seemed to be a sure way of bolstering up British power. This was the real motive behind the idea of Pakistan (separate Moslem and Hindu states in an independent India). Britain knew well enough that such division of the country would be intolerable, but meanwhile it would please the Moslems and bind them to the Empire's cause. But now the Empire discovers it has been nursing a tiger cub. The Moslem League is positively ferocious in its opposition to Britain, which seems at last to have been completely successful in alienating every Indian from its support. In so far as this means a still divided India, the old imperialists in Whitehall may rest content. From this standpoint, says Herbert L. Matthews, the correspondent of the New York *Times*, "the future of India appears in a more unhappy light than ever." But let the Empire be careful! There is a common conviction in India today for independence. Here is a center of unity more potent than any occasion of disunity whatsoever. Divided in many other things, the

Congress and the League are one in their resolve to throw off the British yoke. This fact, combined with the fact of the large Moslem representation in the Congress itself, sheds a different and brighter light on the scene than that discerned by Mr. Matthews.

III

The *Worldover Press* brings some interesting news about Britain and India. It seems that, in the relation between these two great powers, Britain is being rapidly switched from the position of a creditor nation to that of a debtor nation, and India vice versa. Analyzing the debt situation, the London *Economist,* in a recent article, points out that at the beginning of the war India owed Great Britain some 360 million pounds sterling. By the end of this year, the amount will have been reduced to 12 million pounds. During this same period Great Britain's debt to India has increased from 58 million pounds to 345 million pounds as of February 3, 1943. The explanation lies in an agreement signed in 1939 between Britain and the Government of India whereby India was to pay for the upkeep of Indian troops in India, while Britain was to pay as soon as they left Indian soil. Likewise Britain agreed to pay for all imported equipment and capital expenditure incident to the war. Now that India has unexpectedly become the heart of the battle zone, the agreement is all in her favor, with the above financial result which the *Economist* calls "something almost bewildering." I see in all this a possible outcome of the Indian problem which I had not anticipated. Here is the way in which it may work out, if the Empire insists upon denying the Indian people their freedom! At the close of the war, Britain will be hopelessly in debt especially to India, while India will stand free and clear of obligations. This will mean the immediate predominance of creditor over debtor in all that makes for real power. As time goes on, the center of world affairs will shift from West to East. The British Isles will lie on the periphery of civilization with India right at the heart. More and more, with the passing years, the balance will turn, until finally there will come the day when Delhi and not London will be the capital of the Empire. This seems to be an extravagant surmise. But we have seen it all take place before in the case of the Roman Empire, which saw the Eternal City sink slowly into insignificance, until there came the moment when Constantine packed up his goods and chattels, and made Byzantium the capital of his realm. To just such an amazing denouement as this, the present creditor-debtor situation as between Britain and India now points So that heads-you-win, tails-you-lose, India comes out on top. The nation wants to be free, and, God grant, will be free. But failing this by any chance, India will in due course absorb Great Britain. Thus will justice be avenged!

IV

It gives one a curious feeling to read that chattel slavery has been abolished in Ethiopia. Is it possible that slavery has thus continued into our modern world, and in a Christian country? Yes, unhappily, this is true. But the end came with the reconquest of Ethiopia by the British army in this war, for on August 26th last, the Ethiopian Emperor issued a decree of complete emancipation, thus reviving the great precedent of Abraham Lincoln. It is not only possible but highly probable, as the *Worldover Press* reminds us, that the accursed system of bondage will linger on for a time in remote areas of the Abyssinian region. "It is not believed that in the stubborn wilderness regions every last trace of the slave system can be eradicated at once." But the death blow has been struck. The notorious Gabar device, under which a gabar, or payer of taxes, could be compelled to labor for the government, or, if the state did not desire his services, could be forced to work for any private person, is wiped out. Which means that involuntary servitude, at least as an institution, is at an end. As one reads this news, one's mind goes back to Wesley and Wilberforce and Clarkson, and in this country to the abolitionists. One remembers the emancipation of the serfs in Russia by Czar Alexander II. Liberty does march on, even in these days when old slaveries and new, and even more hideous oppressions, are suddenly become a dreadful commonplace of our stricken world. In this case I like to think that the abolition of slavery in this large area of Africa stands to the credit of the United Nations. Amid the gathering darkness of the times, with a new world struggling dangerously and desperately to be born out of the chaos of this stricken globe, it is pleasant to believe that where come the forces of the United Nations, there comes liberty. But there stand the Jews of Tunisia, the natives of Kenya, and the multitudinous peoples of India, not to speak of the Negroes of America, to forbid as yet any such glorious hope. We have still a long way to go toward this goal of human freedom, and war in the long run hurts and does not help the cause. But when any light breaks through the clouds we should rejoice, and pray the more ardently for the blaze of the full day.

V

It is amazing to note how each and every military campaign of the Nazi powers has just fallen short of its objective. Complete and apparently final success has been won up to the last step to triumph—and then it has stopped. "Thus far, and no farther!" Poland, at the very start of the war in 1939, may be regarded as an exception, but this was so limited an objective and in itself so indecisive a battle that it may hardly be said to count. The French campaign swept like a

tornado to the English Channel, but it did not cross that little body of water. The Russian campaign pounded its way to the very gates of Leningrad, Stalingrad and Moscow, but no one of these great cities was taken. The African campaign brought Marshal Rommel's desert army to within seventy miles of Alexandria, but those seventy miles were never passed. The same story sees to be true of Asia. The Japanese assault upon Burma, Malay, Java and the islands of the sea, was terrific. It seemed to sweep everything before it. But the hordes of invaders stopped at the frontiers of India, and never were able to batter their way to Australia. It is fascinating to contemplate this spectacle of victory that always falls short of victory. It reminds one of the immortal story of Sennacherib before the walls of Jerusalem. Is the hand of God in this business, as some of our fundamentalist patriots are arguing? Or is there a law at work here—a moral as well as physical law of diminishing returns? After all, there has never been a world conqueror. Alexander, perhaps, came as near to the goal as any, but he never marched west, and he stopped short at the frontiers of India. Genghis Khan swept over vast territories in Asia and Europe, but turned back at the very moment when he seemed to have everything in his hands. The Moslems were like a tidal flood of arms—but the waves of conquest could not sweep beyond Tours in the west and Vienna in the east. What does all this mean if not that, at the very height of power, there develops an inner weakness which makes the final triumph of arms impossible? There comes the point of exhaustion —the moment when aggression fails. It's like a building too heavy for its foundations—or extended beyond the range of its steel scaffolding. Collapse is inevitable. Which is nature's own way of protecting mankind from death! Physical force, in other words, has its limits. Pressed beyond a certain point, the boiler explodes, the racer falls exhausted, the swimmer drowns. So with the conqueror—he fails! This is the law of life, which being interpreted means the will of God.

VI

Not in a long time have I read a book which has so moved me as William Saroyan's *The Human Comedy*. The author describes the book as a novel, but it is hardly that. Rather is it a string of episodes in the life of a humble American working family in Ithaca, California. Mrs. Macauley is a widow, the mother of the irresistible youngster Ulysses; his brother, Homer, who has just got a job as messenger in the local telegraph office; and his sister Bess. An older brother, Marcus, is in the Army. Then there is Mr. Spangler, the telegraph agent, who carries a hard-boiled egg in his pocket for luck, and his night operator, Mr. Grogan, who carries a whiskey bottle in the drawer of his desk for comfort. Other characters abound, all with their amiable eccentricities and their unfailing good will, and all linked together in a series of what seem to be utterly commonplace happenings in home and neighborhood. But there is a glow about the book as of light in darkness, and a warmth as of a fire in a chill and barren place. The light and the warmth spring from the hearts of people who are as good as they are simple. They reveal an understanding of life which is unmistakable. William Saroyan feels that this world of ours is very pitiful. It brings strange trials and bitter griefs to the people who inhabit it. These trials and griefs are very poignant in these wartimes, but no different at bottom than at other and more quiet times. It is all a "comedy" in the sense that we laugh that we may not weep. Since life is thus pitiful, says Mr. Saroyan, it is elementary that we should all be very kind one to another. How otherwise can we live if we are not thus sympathetic and helpful? Then comes the miracle—that kindness brings healing. Love makes everything bearable, since it joins men together in fellowship. Love springs from heart to heart, and makes all men loving and therefore lovable. And suddenly, as in the coming of spring in the warm air that banishes the winter cold, the world is beautiful. Nothing could be more familiar than this faith in the potency of the loving heart, but William Saroyan, unlike most of us, believes in it. He is as innocent and guileless as St. Francis, and thus produces people who are as good as most of the people in modern novels are vile. In the first chapter of the book there is a scene in which the little Ulysses is watching a freight train go by, and there is a Negro on the train to whom he waves his hand. And the Negro waves back—and as long as they are in sight the child and the man wave happily to one another. That seems to be Saroyan's secret of life—that we people shall wave and smile to one another, and thus love one another, as we pass by upon the road of life.

Of Truth

No man can know the valley till
The day he climbs its highest hill.
Where no walls bar
The vision, each house familiarly built
Becomes a square in a patchwork quilt
Of great design. And thus things are.
Yes, truth is tall,
Taller than wishing. Truth is all,
The yours, the mine, the near and far,
The scattered fragment and the densest star.
Truth waits the seed within the loam.
Truth strides the deep and rides the foam.
Walls can't confine, but wall must bar
Its greatness. . . Who would know his home
Must leave the door ajar.

MADELINE MULVEY.

Jottings

What with Roosevelt and his cigarette, Churchill and his cigar, and Stalin and his pipe, the non-smoker is decidedly out of it in this war.

Ruml is victorious in America, and Rommel is routed in North Africa. What's in a name?

General DeWitt says:

> A Jap's a Jap. They are a dangerous element, whether loyal or not. It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen, theoretically. He is still a Japanese, and you can't change him.

The Reverend Fred L. Shorter, of Seattle, asks if this isn't precisely what Hitler is saying about Jews:

> A Jew's a Jew. It makes no difference whether he is a German citizen or not, theoretically. He is still a Jew, and you can't change him.

The General should see the point, and watch his tongue.

The Militant, a tiny Trotskyite paper in New York, has been denied second-class mailing privileges because its articles are calculated to discourage enlistments. But enlistments are not now allowed! Conscription occupies the entire field. Doesn't the Post Office Department know the laws of the nation?

It was well regarded as a scandal that the first version of the movie, "Mission to Moscow," contained a fabricated scene depicting Trotsky and Ribbentrop conspiring together. No such scene ever took place—it was a lie complete! But Stalin and Ribbentrop *did* meet and conspire together. This is a historical episode. Why not insert this scene into the movie?

The vulgarity of our language constitutes a large part of the evil of race prejudice. The word "Nigger" is rightly an offense to a self-respecting Negro. But so is the word "Chinaman" to a self-respecting Chinese. As for the word "Jap," we may never know how much this did to bring about the war in the Pacific.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Is Labor More Human Than the Church?

KERMIT EBY

Today organized labor presents a challenge to organized religion as the champion of human values. When all the shortcomings and virtues of each are weighed, the labor movement of these times seems the more human.

Organized labor is becoming more and more receptive to the idea of group medicine, coöperatives, and all other schemes for bettering the living conditions of the underprivileged masses. Its sympathies are definitely devoted to human well-being.

In the last election, labor supported President Roosevelt's program for the war and the peace. They did so believing that the war must be won to defeat fascism abroad and preserve democracy's social gains at home.

Organized labor in America is united in its support of the war for freedom. The same can be said for British labor. French labor sympathized with the Spanish Republic.

Organized labor is determined that fascism shall be defeated. The workers of the world know that trade unions are the first to be crushed when fascism takes over. The destruction of trade unions and collective bargaining is followed by the annihilation of all other democratically formed and democratically controlled groups such as coöperatives, mutual benefit societies, and religious fraternities. Labor is first in the *gleichsgehaltung* program; but the church soon follows. Fascism cannot tolerate anything short of complete regimentation. Labor realizes this, but apparently the churches fail to do so and are chiefly concerned with making converts to their creeds and saving themselves institutionally.

Organized labor supports the war not alone because it wishes to protect its rights and its gains under the New Deal. The workers of America and of the world, more than any other group, accept the revolutionary implications of the present struggle. With Vice President Wallace, they share the conviction that the common people of the world are on the march, determined to secure their "quart of milk a day." "Man is the measure" for them. They are today increasingly organized that human life may be enhanced.

Chief among the convictions of those who toil is the belief that an economy which can produce at full capacity for the manufacture of the implements of war can also be made to produce at full capacity in times of peace. An economy of scarcity, which permits the destruction of food and cotton when men are hungry and naked, will never again be tolerated. Nor will 11,000,000 unemployed be satisfied with mere subsistence. There is also a growing conviction that the power which the control of money and credit gives is a power which should be exercised only by government in the interest of all the people. However, many are still more concerned about the balancing of the post war budget than about what is going to happen to people. We accept now the idea of unlimited government credit to produce guns; the test will come at the end of the war when the time comes to use credit to clear slums, build houses, and keep men at work.

While churches cling to narrow creeds which serve as barriers to world unity, organized labor moves swiftly toward acceptance of the ideal of world democracy. In the international scene it is organized labor which is the least isolationist among organized Americans. Both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. in their

conventions welcomed the fraternal delegates from Britain. The British delegates stressed the common interests of the workers the world around. No, indeed, the workers of the world are not narrow nationalists. The C. I. O. in convention assembled called for a second front and all-out support of the war. Many of the delegates were insistent in these demands because they believed that an immediate opening of a second front was the only way to relieve German pressure on Russia and assure a speedy victory for the democracies.

Labor is world-minded. With such exceptions as the Editors of *The Protestant,* churchmen have been ever ready to denounce Russia, whereas there is much sympathy for Russia in the ranks of organized labor. This sympathy grows out of a profound respect for Russian resistance to fascist aggression; but is also affected by Russian mastery of western technology and its use for social ends. To put it bluntly, many a worker believes that Russia has come closer to wisdom and justice toward racial and cultural minorities and toward elimination of economic exploitation of the many by the few than any other nation. Labor is not pacifistic. In fact, the opposite is true. The workers of America are aggressive in their support of the war, aggressive in their support of the New Deal, aggressive in their belief that tomorrow will bring a new day for the exploited of this earth. Theirs is a revolutionary drive!

This drive is not one to be dismissed lightly. There are 10,000,000 organized workers in America. Illinois has 750,000. Altogether, America has a wage-earning population of some 57,000,000. True, many among this 57,000,000 think of themselves as potential property owners and ultimate employers. Labor only begins to make its potential political power felt. However, the number who achieve economic independence is declining almost daily. Tomorrow, if there is any economic security, it will be provided by social security and old-age pension—the creations of government. Consequently, it is important for labor to have men in office who believe in the ever-broadening responsibility of the state in relation to its citizens.

Now let us look at organized Protestantism. Here, in spite of doctrinal professions of brotherhood and righteousness, one does not find a comparable devotion to human values. Thanks to my Dunker heritage and continuing contacts with the church, I have never been without opportunities to move freely in the ranks of organized religion. From time to time, I have tried to explain the revolutionary emphasis of labor to groups of religious leaders. On several occasions I was alarmed by the hostility expressed to what was presumed to be my point of view. In these talks, I stressed the problem of unemployment, of hunger in the midst of plenty, of slums and the need for housing, of the necessity of placing human rights above property rights. I asked my hearers in conclusion what they thought Christ meant when he stressed his "kingdom here on earth." Once, when I attempted to give the historical setting for the development of the worker's reaction to his world and to organized religion, I was called a communist and an enemy of religion.

Organized Protestantism is middle-class, conservative, and to a large extent the strongest support of status quo in the economic world. It is contented and oblivious of social wrong. To put the proposition even more bluntly, organized labor is aggressive in its demands for a better world, in its efforts to advance the social gains of the present era. In doing so, it comes in conflict with the economically more privileged members of the community who make up organized Protestantism.

The number of Protestants represented by the United Christian Council for Democracy and the several fellowships for social justice in the churches are pitifully few. The Religion and Labor Foundation represents those who are the exception, not the rule, among Protestants.

The alternative to this condition in the churches is a militant Christian program spurred by humanist example and leadership, and translating the abstract idealism of the "good people" into a definite social program. This can be done best by such projects as the work camps of the Quakers in Mexico, of the Unitarians in Michigan, and of the Church of the Brethren in Florida. Such programs bring young people into contact with economic reality. Humanists cannot justly criticize the theistic churches unless and until their program includes action for human betterment. The Humanist, even if a solitary individual in an orthodox community, should always be distinguished by energetic devotion to people in courageous and specific ways. Example counts. These work camps are limited in their scope; too few people are affected by them. Yet their example points in the right direction. Another practical approach for organized religion would be the encouragement and training of young Christians for work in factories and active participation in their union. This world needs men of principle who can serve on labor management councils in the best interests of all concerned.

The humanizing of the churches and the translation of humanistic doctrine into human values alike call for effort applied to the solution of specific problems in the world of practical affairs.

World peace can only be achieved by the elimination bit by bit of the social and economic tensions which produce war. It follows, then, that the man best fitted to draw up a just peace is one whose voting record and civic activities indicate his interest in civil liberties, anti-poll tax legislation, slum clearance, social security, and so forth. As Gandhi so truly said, the American Negro in the slums is our India. Similarly, the faith—theist or Humanist—whose adherents display greatest zeal for human well-being will present the most convincing credentials.

Today the Church of the Brethren is pacifist. As a member, I share its opposition to war. However, it seems incredible to me that opposition to war should cause comfortable Brethren and comfortable Methodists and comfortable Baptists to support men for political office who oppose the social gains without which there can be no peace within the state or between states.

Therefore, until I am convinced that $5,000 per year suburban Protestants are conditioned by what they hear preached on Sunday—or what they should hear—instead of by what they practice on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in our competitive business world, I see more hope for tomorrow in the revolution of the workers than in the conservatism of the comfortable. Recognizing merits and shortcomings in both institutions, it seems clear that, as now organized, labor is broader in its human sympathies and more sincere in its idealism than the church.

Wanted: A West Point for Peace Leadership

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL

Our peace movements have so far failed to eliminate war, largely because they have been led by amateurs, most of whom were decidedly part time. This fact should cast no aspersions upon the efforts of earnest, sincere men and women who devote themselves to the great cause of peace in the midst of lives unavoidably busy with other concerns. But at the same time, we must recognize as quickly as possible that the problems of this war and of the coming peace are highly technical, and that no peace movement which is merely a side line of busy ministers, educators, and social workers whose training and interests lie primarily in other fields can possibly succeed. As the time came when it was necessary to replace the blacksmith who pulled teeth by the specially trained dentist, and the barber who let blood by the trained surgeon, so the time has come when those who would lead the peace movement must be specially trained for their jobs.

The first essential is obviously the establishment of adequate opportunities for such training. At present these do not exist. Those who wish to become physicians can readily secure a thoroughly scientific and well-rounded training in both basic knowledges and effective techniques and skills. For those who would become engineers there are many schools which focus the best results of scientific knowledge and tested techniques upon their problems. Military leaders are given the very best of training. Hitler knows better than to depend upon week-end conferences and inspirational addresses for the training of his officers. There is in the world today no institution in which those who would become leaders for peace can secure an education comparable in either thoroughness or extent. Obviously no such program of training could be established overnight. But it is high time that some institution or group made a really serious attempt to provide such opportunities for training.

Without attempting to outline either the details or the order of such a curriculum, it may be well to suggest something of the content and scope of a training for peace leadership which would prove really adequate.

1. *The Etiology of War and Peace.* Certainly peace leadership must be taught to distinguish between the *occasions* for war, and the *causes* for war. In private life we often say that one man killed another because of a quarrel. Most people who quarrel, however, do not kill. Obviously, the quarrel was not the *cause,* but the *occasion* for the murder. The real causes lay in the attitudes of the killer, and the social influences which in part produced them. So it is with international conflict. Most of the explanations offered as the *causes* for war (or Hitler) are the *occasions.* Careful investigation has clearly revealed that any social condition *can* occasion war, and no social situation *needs* to. It is simple and easy to say that any given condition, such as economic difficulties, social injustice and oppression, or the usual "historical background" explanations of historians "caused" a given war, and to find plenty of instances in which they seem to have occasioned it. But there are many other instances in which far worse conditions did not cause war, but actually made for peace. Why? Why did the "injustices of Versailles" cause war, while the far greater injustices which the United States imposed upon Mexico in 1848 did not? Why do the Germans fight for *lebensraum* while the Swiss and the Uruguayans do not? If poverty impelled the Italians and Japanese into aggression, why did it not more so impel the peoples of China and India? If the Allies caused Hitler, why were the similar policies of Bismarck followed by folk schools and cooperatives in Denmark and by democracy in France? The real questions which peace leaders have as yet not carefully studied are: (1) Under what conditions do poverty, prosperity, capitalism, democracy, oppression, or any other situation make either for peace or for war? (2) Conversely, in what ways, and under what conditions does the resort to violence make for the loss of culture, basic human freedoms, and similar values, and under what conditions is fighting essential for their preservation?

2. *The Psychology of War and Peace.* Obviously the incidents and social conditions usually given as causes for war are really only its occasions. The real causes for either war or peace lie in the attitudes of those who can make the decisions. (Social and economic conditions are important primarily because they may, under some conditions, create attitudes in people which make for war or peace.) Wars, then, are far more than moral problems, institutions, or social conditions. They are volcanic vents through which the fears, hatreds, and insecurities of individual people find opportunity for eruption. No leadership is qualified to deal with war effectively until it is able to grapple with it at its psychological roots, where the basic drives of men are pressured and fermented into fervid resentments and explosive demands. A thorough knowledge of the psychology of hostilities, aggression, altruism, and coöperation is as essential to the peace leader as is a knowledge of anatomy and physiology to the physician.

How is this necessary knowledge to be secured? So far, direct research into the psychological causes of international conflict has been negligible. At present our only important source of scientific knowledge concerning the conflicts, hostilities, and aggressions which eventuate in war must come from such fields as child development, psychiatry, animal psychology, anthropology, and sociology. Scattered among the numerous studies of these areas are findings sufficiently extensive and validated to indicate clearly and unmistakably why our peace programs are unable to withstand the strain of serious social crisis. Only those thoroughly familiar with the major import of such studies are in a position to give effective guidance to a peace movement which is really sound and effective.

Yet our present knowledge is not enough. A "West Point" for peace leadership would also become a center for continued and serious research. We shall not have permanent peace until we become sufficiently serious about the problem of war to study it seriously. Essential for this is the establishment of a center in which something like the focused scientific knowledge which goes into preparations for war, will be directed toward the promotion of peace.

3. *The Development of Adequate Skills and Techniques.* Important as are verbal experiences in most learning, one cannot learn dentistry, swimming, football, surgery, or peace leadership merely by "reading books." Nothing can take the place of practice in actually doing what is to be learned. This practice in promoting peace

must mean far more than a monastic withdrawal into coöperative societies, camps, or communities with a group of highly selected people with an extensive background of social and psychological conditionings favorable to socialized relationships. Peace which is worth anything must be workable in highly unfavorable situations and among all kinds of people: good and bad, honorable and crooked, submissive and domineering.

Obviously, the methods which will "work" will depend largely upon the particular situation to which they are applied. Therefore, training and skill in diagnosis must constitute an important phase of the training of peace leadership. The leader who prescribes the same treatment for all ailments, whether in medicine or in international relationships, is not a sound leader, but a quack. Thus the methods which Gandhi employed with great effectiveness against the relatively humane and tolerant British autocracy, proved destructive when used by the Tainos of the West Indies against early Spanish explorers. One of the crucial issues which so far has produced plenty of rigid dogmatism but has never been really studied, concerns the place of violence and coercion as means for achieving essential social results. A peace movement which is to be effective must be led by those who are more than vendors of patent solutions applied indiscriminately to complex and divergent situations. What will work where, and when administered by whom; how to direct policies so that they will not result in more harm than good—this the sound peace leader must know with a thoroughness now almost impossible to attain.

4. *The Education of the Masses for Peace.* A "West Point" for peace leadership would naturally become the apex of the total peace movement where those who assumed positions of full-time, professional leadership would secure their training, without which they would not be granted acceptance. Its next task would be to see that those social leaders who were not specialists, became acquainted with the import and significance of its most important findings. This would involve a complete revision of the content of institutes, brief conferences, and other educational activities for the training of socially-minded ministers, social workers, teachers, and administrators in the promotion of world peace. Through these "non-commissioned officers" would come the effective education of the rank and file. This program, also, would undergo basic revision. So far our peace work has been largely straight propaganda, the purpose of which has been the promotion of a particular policy or program. The first purpose of this would be scientific interpretations and fundamental understandings. As the ordinary person has come to see problems of health in terms of bacteriology, vitamins, and similar scientific understandings, so he can and will be taught to see the problems of war and peace basically, so that his reactions toward broader social policies involved in international relations will be discriminating and intelligent.

Obviously such a "West Point" for peace leadership will not spring full grown from the forehead of Zeus. It must be based upon years of planning and experience. The important consideration is to make a start, however small. Let some college, university, or theological seminary begin—if necessary by pointing existing courses toward such a program until a more complete curriculum could be established. Let those individuals or groups who call upon us to repent of our sins, begin by repenting of the sin of rushing actively into a situation without familiarizing themselves with the major scientific findings in the field, and bring forth fruits worthy of repentance by establishing a foundation or an institute for peace in connection with some educational institution. Our night of travail and catastrophe can end only when our wails of despair and blind adherence to dogmas are replaced by the best and most scientific intelligence of which we are capable. For many who have so loudly protested their devotion to peace, the challenge is "Put up or shut up." The individual or the institution which moves toward the establishment of a "West Point" for peace leadership will become the real spearhead of a spearless day.

How Safe Are Sanctions?

O. A. HAMMAND

The big dictators in all of our enemy countries, and their advisors and assistants, should be tried in regular courts of law and punished in accordance with the verdict. Under these conditions, of course, it is almost certain that the defendants would be found guilty and that the extreme penalty would be imposed. Remember that I do not say that any cruel or unusual punishment should be imposed. The old, old rule against cruel and unusual punishments must not be broken just because we want to get rid of some of the world's worst offenders. There will follow—there probably must follow—the punishment of many little men among the assassins who have done the rough work for the dictators in their ruthless campaign. Their day is sure to come, but it should not come by a mob. A mob in the street does not know and has no way to discriminate between the good and the bad, the innocent and the guilty. Let us hope that there will be no "murder zone" between the fall of the vanquished and the occupation of the victorious. It would be intelligent for the enemy countries to make their own approach and make it in time to save that terrible three weeks when blood runs in the streets, for it will be their own blood.

The big thing in "after the war or the peace" is the character of the mechanism to carry on with order and justice. If we guess right, all is well; if not, then we must get ready for World War III. One suggestion is an army. Is this the solution? The answer is, "No!" The army is an instrument of war and should be used for only a limited time to feed the people and establish order, then it should give way to a peaceful regime. It is the business of an army to impose the arbitrary will of a nation or a group of nations on another nation or group of nations, and the causes and consequences, the rights and wrongs, are not considered and have no part in it. It is the business of an army to invade, to capture, to kill, to destroy and to do anything bad or good, dishonest or honest, secretly or in the open. Fair play means nothing, it must not be permitted; love,

loyalty, and sportsmanship are out. It must take every advantage; it must misrepresent; it must deceive; it must strike in the dark and strike hard and strike first. No matter what it does or how it does it, if it strikes the enemy and defeats the enemy and grinds down the enemy and destroys the enemy, it is doing its job. Victory is the only thing, and the method of victory is always justified and does not matter. No! An army is not the way. It is an instrument of war and no part of peace.

There is all the difference in the world between an army and a police force. An army is responsible to no political control, legislative or judicial control. It carries out the supreme and arbitrary will of a sovereign state which makes its own rules and takes its own action against an enemy. But the police is something entirely different. Policemen are duly authorized officers of the law, to act toward all the public the same, under a constitution and written laws, and are automatically authorized to do two things: stop a fight and make an arrest. But that is about as far as a policeman has a right to go. It is far enough. The idea of an international police is a good one, but it cannot start with the international police. Back of it must be the whole legal system. Some world group with legislative powers, or the equivalent thereof, that represents the different nations of the world and is democratic in its organization must be back of it. And there must be also the judicial feature. The men, soldiers or police, no matter what we call them, must have an official capacity and must be authorized to do certain things and have only limited authority.

The legal system should be universal. No country should be left out. There is no one excepted from our American law. It applies to all. It would not be very effective for a gangster in one of our American cities to say to a judge:

> Count me out of this. I do not recognize your law. I have never signed your constitution or any of your federal statutes or state laws or city ordinances and will not be bound by them. I refuse to coöperate.

That kind of a man would not get very far in our society and that kind of a nation will not get very far in a world society if it ever comes. Getting to the point quickly, there is not much chance for a world society to succeed in a big way, like the prevention of war, so long as any large nation or group of nations refuses to recognize it and coöperate with it. It will take a very large preponderance of strength on the side of law enforcement before the world police can go into an enemy country and examine their shipyards, steel plants, docks, and railroad stations, and on the ground find out for sure that no violation is made of the disarmament rule.

A big army will not provide safety nor security nor a moment of rest or easiness. A big army that got out of control and in the hands of the wrong kind of people might become the greatest menace that the world ever had. But an international police, made to enforce a fair and just rule of law of universal application, will provide security, justice, and peace. After all, it is just putting the law in the hands of the people; just extending our law and order system from the city, county, state, and nation to a world basis.

Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago

[UNITY gladly gives publicity to this significant Release from the Office of Press Relations of the University of Chicago. Such an example of coöperation on the part of four theological schools in conjunction with a great university is an inspiration to all who hope and work for the larger outlook in things theological.—*Curtis W. Reese.*]

Organization of the largest Protestant theological faculty in America, through the federation of the full-time teaching staffs of the four theological schools associated with the University of Chicago, was recently announced by President Robert M. Hutchins of the University.

The University of Chicago Divinity School, Baptist in origin; the Chicago Theological Seminary, Congregational; Meadville Theological School, Unitarian and Universalist; and the Disciples Divinity House have agreed to pool their faculties to provide closer coöperation in teaching to strengthen their effectiveness in training ministers of all denominations.

The combined faculties will be called the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. The organization, effective July 1, will include thirty-two scholars and religious leaders, constituting one of the outstanding Protestant theological faculties of the world.

Dean Ernest C. Colwell of the Divinity School said:

> This federation of independent schools which serve different churches is in line with a major movement in American Protestantism. Important American churches are now working toward greater unification and the elimination of duplication.
>
> Similarly, in the field of theological education, the four schools forming the federation believe that there are important gains to be achieved. Among these is elimination of overlapping and duplication of the work of the faculty. Appointment of future members of the federated faculty will be coördinated. We plan also to coördinate our respective libraries so as to eliminate duplication of acquisitions, and so free funds for systematic development of the library facilities.

No change in the financial independence, ecclesiastical affiliation, business operations, or self-government of the respective institutions is contemplated because of the federation.

The federated faculty, whose full-time members will be members of the University of Chicago faculty, will constitute the faculty of the individual institutions and will have control of the common elements of the Bachelor of Divinity curriculum. This common core will be approximately two-thirds of the curriculum, with one-third remaining the area of each individual institution, to provide for its particular denominational interests.

All students in the four institutions will be registered as graduate students of the University, with minimum academic entrance requirements being the equivalent of graduation from the College of the University of Chicago, which ends at the end of the traditional sophomore year. Students completing the theological training will receive the Bachelor of Divinity degree, conferred by the University of Chicago in coöperation with the respective institutions.

Administration of the Federated Theological Faculty will be conducted by an executive council, or cabinet, consisting of the heads of the four institutions. At present, these are: Dean Ernest C. Colwell; President Albert W. Palmer of the Chicago Theological Seminary; President Sydney B. Snow of Meadville Theological School; and Dean Edward Scribner Ames of the Disciples Divinity House.

Agreement on the federation, which has been under discussion for the past year, is a development growing out of the benefits of close association of the three independent schools, which have been related to the University through working agreements with the Divinity School.

All of the institutions except the Disciples Divinity House are older than the University of Chicago, which was founded in 1891.

The Divinity School of the University is a continuation of the Baptist Union Theological Seminary, founded in 1865 and opened in 1866 in Morgan Park, then a Chicago suburb. When the University was founded, the Seminary moved to the Midway, and became the University's Divinity School, though still retaining its connection with the Baptist Theological Union. As a result of joint decision of the University and the Union in 1908, the Divinity School has admitted students without requiring that they be Baptists.

The Chicago Theological Seminary, founded in 1855, opened classes in 1858 in the First Congregational Church, on Chicago's near west side, at Washington Boulevard and Green Street. From 1865 to 1915 it was located at Ashland Avenue and Washington Boulevard, moving to its present site, University Avenue and Fifty-eighth Street. Since 1913 it has been affiliated with the University. Its students and those of the Divinity School could take one-third of their work in either institution, and some faculty members held appointments in both schools.

Meadville Theological School, oldest of the coöperating seminaries, was founded in 1844 as a Unitarian seminary in Meadville, Pa., and moved to Chicago in 1928, where it has a large house and a classroom and library building on adjacent corners of Woodlawn Avenue and 57th Street. In 1928, a union was formed between Meadville and the Ryder Divinity School, of the Universalist denomination, which had moved from Galesburg, Ill., in 1917, and affiliated with the University.

The Disciples Divinity House was founded in 1894 and has always occupied its present site at 57th Street and University Avenue. On its foundation, it entered into affiliation with the University, its officers and faculty becoming members of the University, and its students having the privileges of University students.

Personnel of the full-time federated faculty as now constituted is as follows: James Luther Adams, Professor of the Psychology and Philosophy of Religion; Walker Moore Alderton, Associate Professor of Student Field Work; Edward Scribner Ames, Dean of Disciples Divinity House; Edwin Ewart Aubrey, Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics.

William Barnett Blakemore, Assistant Professor of Christian Theology; Raymond A. Bowman, Assistant Professor of Oriental Languages; Ernest John Chave, Professor of Religious Education; Ernest Cadman Colwell, Dean of the Divinity School, Professor of New Testament Literature; Mervin M. Deems, Professor of Church History; Fred Eastman, Professor of Biography and Drama; Davis Edwards, Associate Professor of Speech; Charles Whitney Gilkey, Associate Dean of the Divinity School, Professor of Preaching; Charles Hartshorne, Associate Professor of Philosophy; Albert Eustace Haydon, Professor of Comparative Religion; Charles Thomas Holman, Associate Professor of Pastoral Duties.

William A. Irwin, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature; Samuel Kincheloe, Professor of Sociology of Religion; Bernard MacDougall Loomer, Assistant Professor of Ethics; Charles Lyttle, Professor of Church History; John Thomas McNeill, Professor of the History of European Christianity; Sidney Earl Mead, Assistant Professor of the History of Christian Thought in America; Fred Neal, Powys Smith Instructor in Divinity; James Hasting Nichols, Jr., Gerald Birney Smith Instructor in Divinity; Albert Wentworth Palmer, President of The Chicago Theological Seminary, Professor of Practical Theology; Wilhelm Pauck, Professor of Historical Theology; Sydney Bruce Snow, President and Dean of Meadville Theological School, Professor of Preaching and Ministry.

William Warren Sweet, Professor of the History of American Christianity; Ross Snyder, Associate Professor of Religious Education; Henry Nelson Wieman, Professor of Christian Theology; Allen Paul Wikgren, Assistant Professor of New Testament Language; Amos N. Wilder, Professor of New Testament Interpretation; Daniel Day Williams, Associate Professor of Christian Theology; Harold Rideout Willoughby, Associate Professor of New Testament Literature; John Albert Wilson, Professor of Egyptology, Director of the Oriental Institute.

Isaiah's Vision

I see a world serene and just
Where dictators have turned to dust,
A world without a prison, damp;
Without a concentration camp.

A world without a tyrant's greed
To steal from men the things they need;
A world where no usurper craves
To make his fellowmen his slaves.

I see a world of love and truth
Without a law conscripting youth,
A world where man may then pursue
His faith, his creed, his point of view.

'Tis then Isaiah says that men
Shall never go to war again;
Of swords and spears with which men fought
Will pruning-hooks and plows be wrought.

RONALD EYRICH.

Fatherless Families

ETHEL S. BEER

There is today a prejudice, to me inexplicable, against the idea of the single woman adopting children and thereby establishing a fatherless family. Given a fair chance many such women would make excellent mothers. But the present bias against this practice is strong.

There is no feeling against the single woman who buys a pet and showers her affection upon it. Nor is she discouraged from raising other people's children, either in a private home or in an institution. The majority of nurses and governesses are "old maids" and there is a preponderance of women in the teaching and social service professions, many of whom never marry. Yet no matter how capable these women may be, or how much experience they have had with children, the outcry is loud when one of them contemplates founding a fatherless family. Only rarely is the single woman permitted to adopt children.

Somewhat more frequently two women have been granted the privilege. The claim is made that in case one of them dies there will still be someone responsible for the children. This is undeniable. But is it reasonable or wise to thus restrict the services of the unattached woman? Few have an intimate friend willing and able to form such a partnership. Nor are such relationships always enduring. Like marriage they may go on the rocks before the child reaches maturity. Apparently this aspect is not considered overmuch, since the emphasis is placed on children having two protectors even though they are of the same sex.

Admittedly the preference is for married couples. The societies handling adoption are usually adamant in this rule. They insist that a father and a mother are the basis of normal family life. In placing children for adoption they insist upon retaining the semblance of a real family. Therefore, a husband and a wife are the accepted solution.

If children were crying to be adopted, the policy might be more flexible. But the supply of children is not large enough to fill the demand. Particularly for babies, applicants have to wait months and sometimes years. Without exaggeration, golden-haired, blue-eyed girl babies can rarely be provided as quickly as requests are received. In fact, for all children under six there is seldom a dearth of prospective parents. Since, then, there must be a limitation of prospective adopting parents, it seems reasonable to give couples the first choice, thus practically excluding the unattached woman.

My contention is that any such discrimination is unfair, both to the unattached woman and the children. There are many potential mothers who have not and never will go through the biological experience. This is admitted since sterile wives are allowed to adopt children. It is the marriage, then, which wins the approbation of the public.

But happy marriages are far from the rule. The husband and wife are often at cross purposes. They may remain under the same roof but are miles apart spiritually. Frequently this is blamed on a void in their home, a void which children will fill. Hence if they are unable to have one of their own, they turn to adoption as a substitute. Naturally, this reason is not given when they file their application, nor is it always discovered by the investigator. In a casual visit it is not so easy to sense such a breach, especially since for the moment the couple are united in purpose. Perhaps for a time a child will stave off a separation. But it is improbable that this will be permanent. Eventually the child finds itself with one parent or the other, and it is too late to do anything since the adoption has been legalized. Such cases are apt to escape notice, or at least they are not counted against the accepted practice.

Nor is the fact that a husband and wife may be so engrossed in their own interests that they have little time for their children. The father may be too selfish to allow the mother to take proper care of her own children. Anxious as they appeared to be to fill their home with a family, the children may see little of their parents. Many adopted children are brought up almost entirely by a nurse or governess. But no one seems to consider this neglect because it is customary in certain circles.

Obviously, adopted children are not the only ones who suffer from such situations. Parents of means treat their own children in a similar fashion. This is bad enough. But for adopted children such circumstances are even worse. A child whose birth is hidden in obscurity is exceedingly sensitive. It has a feeling of difference because of its unknown origin. Often this results in a sense of inferiority which may warp its whole life. To counteract this an abundance of love, intelligently controlled, is essential. The unattached woman may have just this to offer.

Of course, she has no husband to share her burden. But this may have advantages. She is spared the double responsibility of being a wife and a mother. There is no other strong emotional tie to wean her from her children who are wanted to fill this very gap. Particularly if she is independent financially, she will not have anything else to weaken her sense of duty. Even if she has important work, it is not the same as a family tie. Although she may be supporting the children, she can still find time to devote to them. Obviously, no mother should confine herself entirely to her children. If she does, she will grow stale on the job. But there is a vast difference between taking occasional respite and not assuming any of the actual care of her children. The single woman with no husband to contend with is more likely to make her children her first consideration. Why else should she adopt them?

Of course, there are many women today bringing up children without a father. Widows do manage to guide their sons and daughters to maturity. Because of the unexpected emptiness in their lives, they may be more devoted mothers than ever before. They try to make up for the loss of the father, and in numerous instances do.

Sometimes maiden aunts are left in charge of a niece or nephew. Often they are excellent substitute mothers, filling her place in everything but name. Since they have never had any children their outlook is slightly different from that of parents. The child is not a being created by them to be regarded as a possession but a person to develop according to its own potentialities. Besides, they still have the problems of the unmarried clear in their minds and can approach these with real

understanding. This is particularly important for adolescents.

The point, however, is that there is no outcry against such a procedure. The mother may be pitied if left alone to bring up her children but it is taken as a matter of course. Not even the maiden aunt is looked at askance if entrusted with a niece or nephew. If present, she will probably be pressed into service automatically. She is a convenient solution for the father, at least until he marries again. Since, then, these unattached women are regarded as normal guardians of children, why should others not prove just as satisfactory?

Under the circumstances, it is not fair to discriminate against the single woman who wants to adopt children. This is the only motherhood that she can enjoy without stigma. Only thus will she have a chance to found a real home, unless tragedy plays a part and presents her with the children of relatives. Besides, if she is sufficiently competent to take care of these children why should she not undertake a family of her own? How inconsistent it is to discourage her from filling her own existence by adopting children but permit her to assume a responsibility resulting from an accident!

It is unreasonable to think that no unmarried woman can make children as happy as they would be with a married couple. Even the most conservative person cannot deny that many parents fail miserably. Why then pick on the single woman who may be fond and very understanding of children? Why should she not be given an equal chance to prove her worth?

My suggestion is that every case of prospective adoption should be examined on its own merits. No arbitrary ruling should exist to exclude the unattached woman from the joy of assumed motherhood. Her status, married or not, does not make a home appropriate. There are too many other determinants affecting family happiness which should count as an equal influence.

Since a mother is the strongest force in her children's lives, her qualifications are of the utmost importance. In her favor are intelligence, interest, knowledge of children, and ability to support them. The mother should be so situated economically that she does not have to worry but she should not be so rich that she pampers the child instead of fitting it for life. Poverty is not an asset for a child but neither is extreme wealth. A child may be hurt because it has not enough but it is apt to be spoiled when it receives too much. The child has the best chance in a home of comfort without luxury. The mother should be simple, yet have intellectual appreciation.

Perhaps one way to discover the potentiality of a mother is to trace her daily life. Is she a social gadabout, flitting from one party to the next? Is she one of a throng always following fashion's trend, or has she serious interests? Naturally she does not need to be a bluestocking to qualify as a conscientious mother. Nor should she be so analytical that she will make her children self-conscious. They need a degree of lightheartedness and spontaneity in their mother.

But no mother should be so bent on pleasure that she begrudges time to her children. No matter whether she has a husband or not, this type is not fit to be entrusted with the guidance of youth. Nothing can be done about selfish, frivolous parents. But at least such individuals should be prevented from adopting children. They ought not be used to heal a marital rift or to sober a silly, scatter-brained young lady. The home should be suitable before the child is placed there.

A consideration worth mention, particularly in the case of the single woman, is a strong personality. Boys especially need a firm hand to guide them. Although a man supposedly contributes this, fathers do not always fit the bill. Many a mother finds her discipline upset when father comes home in the evening. Because of his emotional attachment he may be anything but a strict parent. Nevertheless, a single woman has her hands full. Therefore, it is essential that she should be objective in her viewpoint. She cannot afford to be sentimental about keeping her children babies. On the contrary, she must lead them towards independence as quickly as possible. For this, training and experience are necessary.

Very often a single woman is much better prepared for motherhood than her married sister. Robbed of the chance to have children of her own, her devotion may have prompted her to study the subject thoroughly. In this way she may have acquired knowledge which fits her far better than biological birth. "Why do so many 'old maids' know so much about children?" a doctor asked me once. "Simply because they take the time to learn about them," I replied.

Then, too, those who are fond of children are constantly borrowing them. The teacher takes home a small pupil, the nurse a patient, and so on. Perhaps this occasional responsibility cannot be compared with actual parenthood. But the fact that it is assumed voluntarily seems to point to a love of the actual care of the child. Many an unmarried woman is eager to watch and tend a child day by day instead of shifting this task to a servant. Her whole past has prepared her to do it.

In this case at least, the children will have one parent amply equipped for her job. Is this not better than two parents who know nothing about it? Married couples more often than not have children without the wish to do so and take on a family with no forethought. Children demand time, patience, and previous consideration. Viewed in this light, the fatherless family has certain advantages. Nor can it be claimed that there are too few children available. It is a question of which is to be the accepted way of placing them. Perhaps if all couples were perfect, my plea would be in vain. But under the circumstances it would seem that the unattached mother, capable of heading a family, deserves a square deal.

"Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them. They come, in time, to take these rights for granted and to assume their protection is assured. We, however, who have seen these privileges lost in other continents and other countries can now appreciate their meaning to those people who enjoyed them once and now no longer can. We understand in some measure what their loss can mean. And by that realization we have come to a clearer conception of their worth to us, and to a stronger and more unalterable determination that here in our land they shall not be lost or weakened or curtailed."

—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Study Table

When War Was Outlawed

S. O. Levinson and the Pact of Paris. A Study in the Techniques of Influence. *By John E. Stoner. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.* 368 *pp.* $4.00.

Here is a formidable book,—as formidable as was the will and purpose of the leading character it portrays. And it does not provide easy reading. It is the complicated record of a peace program which began during the perilous days of World War I, when Salmon O. Levinson, a lawyer and private citizen of Chicago, almost single-handed undertook to stop the war dead in its tracks. That was in 1914, two years before the United States was itself drawn into the struggle. It ended with the signing of the Pact of Paris on August 27, 1928, almost exactly fourteen years later.

Between these two dates, S. O. Levinson labored day and night in behalf of a plan to abolish war "forever." The word "forever" strikes an ironical note; and, indeed, there is grim irony in the book itself when one thinks of it as being published in the midst of a much greater war than that in which the Levinson plan was conceived. Even so, the record is there, and that is important in itself. There was a Kellogg Pact, there was a League of Nations, and there were peace movements aplenty, and yet the second war came. And because of the record and the failure, some lessons in the "cause and cure" of war should be remembered when the time comes once more to set the world on the road to peace.

But it is the record, or only that part of it which bears the Levinson stamp, with which this book is concerned. All the documents, letters, reports, and other personal records which Mr. Levinson accumulated during these years were turned over to the University of Chicago shortly after his death, and to these Doctor Stoner had full access when he wrote his book.

A rare personality is thus revealed: a man who had decided opinions, who took discouragement in his stride, and who did not know the meaning of defeat. Few men ever have such a driving and tenacious purpose as that which sustained him; few men could have subjected themselves to such labors, and not often does a man gladly invest his wealth, along with his time and energy, in behalf of a great social cause which from beginning to end is doomed to defeat. The outlawry of war was the great mission of Levinson's life and it provided him with a simple, all-compelling purpose. There was a devastating world conflict and there must not be another! Moreover, since adequate legal machinery was lacking to establish international peace, he would devote his life to setting it up. As he looked about for ideas and techniques of procedure, every moment was a precious opportunity out of which the last drop of usefulness had to be squeezed, and every man of influence was a potential supporter who had to be enlisted. In October, 1914, he read excerpts of an eloquent address which John Haynes Holmes had made on some phase of the peace problem. Forthwith he wrote for the manuscript. In November he read in the New York *Times* a running debate between Jacob Schiff and President Charles W. Eliot. Without delay he sought to enlist these men in his cause.

There follows a veritable pageantry of distinguished names across the pages of this book. Holmes and Levinson lost no time in understanding one another, and each prodded the other into greater activity. John Dewey was brought into the picture, and Raymond Robins and Charles C. Morrison, and soon, also, Senator Borah. The problem of winning and holding "the lion of Idaho" would provide more than enough material for a separate book. Borah showed flashes of zeal, but only flashes. Between these there were long periods of cautious waiting and indecision which almost drove the inner circle to distraction. Each took his turn to hold him in line. At times all such efforts seemed futile. Borah stubbornly refused to take the lead. Inch by inch he was pushed and dragged by a group of resolute men who simply had to enlist his great prestige and his oratorical gifts in their cause.

Finally, in February, 1923, Borah introduced his resolution favoring outlawry, and promised that in the not distant future he would deliver in its support the best address of which he was capable. Hoping against hope Levinson waited for that speech. Telegrams, letters, telephone calls, personal interviews followed, and all to no avail; the lion would not come out of his lair. Dewey was enlisted to see what he could do, Morrison tried his hand, other friends offered their services to stir the recalcitrant Borah into action. Love's labor was lost. All they got was a half-hearted utterance of doubtful value long after the most difficult obstacles had been surmounted without benefit of his leadership.

But this was only one of Levinson's troubles. To England he went, to France, to Washington. More trips! More telegrams! More literature! And the cost of all these activities he bore almost single-handed. Prodigiously he labored to keep the walls and beams of his slowly emerging structure from caving in on him. He had to overcome French cynicism, British skepticism, and American isolationism. He had an unenthusiastic Coolidge and an uninformed Harding on his hands, and there were serious differences of thought and procedure within the small group itself. It seemed a slow and heartbreaking job at times; and yet, when one remembers that it all happened in fourteen short years, the result seemed like a miracle.

When the pact was finally signed the white light of recognition shone on many a personage who did less than Levinson to bring about its consummation. Senator Borah's refusal to give the movement the leadership of which he was capable was a great disappointment, and it strained his friendship with Levinson almost to the breaking point. But the friendship was never broken. Indeed, Levinson's unshakable faith in and respect for the senator is one of the moving touches of this story. As a final testimony of his affection, he established at the University of Idaho the William Edgar Borah Outlawry of War Foundation.

A reappraisal of the Kellogg Pact, and of Levinson's place in the history of war resistance, will be in order when the present war has become history, and when the problem of "outlawry" can be seen in new perspectives. It is a safe assumption, however, that so far as we can see ahead now, there will never be another attempt to "outlaw" war by completely sidestepping the underlying economic problems which are so great a cause for war.

Levinson was a lawyer, and his was exclusively a legal approach to outlawry; and there is not a shred of evidence that either he or any of those most closely associated with him ever came to grips with the underlying causes of war. Their plan was an audacious one, and it still stirs the imagination; but from the perspective of 1943 it is incredible that anyone ever really expected it to abolish war. Even so, we may be glad that the attempt was made. It is not without its lessons, now, and it was for a while a fresh breeze blowing through the world. It focused men's thoughts and aspirations on the greatest of unsolved problems; and that in itself was a gain which has never been entirely dissipated.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

Meditations

WITH THE MASTER. *By Phillippe Vernier, translated by Edith Lovejoy Pierce. New York: Fellowship Publications, 2929 Broadway. 75 cents.*

The first thing I want to do in this review is to pay tribute to Mrs. Pierce, who has done an exquisite work of translation. One never is reminded, in reading the pages of this book, that it was written originally in a foreign tongue. I have not seen the French text, but I have reason to believe that the translation into English is as accurate and sensitive as it is beautiful.

With the Master is "a book of meditations," worthy to be ranked with the great religious classics of history —with Thomas à Kempis, the *Theologia Germanica,* and Brother Lawrence. The author, Philippe Vernier, is a French Protestant, already world-famous for his exalted spirit and single-minded devotion to his ideal of absolute Christianity. Refused ordination by his ecclesiastical superiors because of his uncompromising pacifism, he has three times gone to prison for his faith, once being held in solitary confinement for a period of two years. His testimony before courts and military tribunals has been of sublime dignity and sweetness of temper. His work, between prison-sentences, for boys, the poor and the sick, the wayward and the afflicted, has been of a Franciscan quality of self-abnegation. "If he has not kissed a leper or changed clothes with a tattered beggar," writes Rufus M. Jones, in his lovely introduction to this volume, "he has done many similar things that fitted the time and place." Vernier, to put it very simply and directly, is a saint.

His meditations are brief—no one of them runs to more than a page! In form they are comments on selected New Testament texts; in essence they are the rare distillation of the spirit of Christ. What it means to heed and follow the Master, in this day as in the earlier day, is what concerns this devout disciple. Doctor Jones rightly finds that "love is the outstanding note of these meditations." To this I would add courage, in the face of the fact that true Christianity means the sacrifice of all precious worldly things, and joy of spirit in obedience to Christ. Few men in our time have suffered more than Philippe Vernier, yet he is serenely happy, and even joyous. Here is the Franciscan quality again. "Sing unto the Lord" is the subject of his first meditation, which he begins by quoting St. Francis, "What are the servants of God if not singers whose task it is to lift up the hearts of men and urge them to spiritual joy?"

Vernier in his life, and now in this written testimony, has proved himself one of these "servants of God." A world which holds such a man is not yet lost.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

An Open Letter to Robert Maynard Hutchins

Sir:

In your admirable and vigorous plea for a sound and enlightened educational system, based on Humanism and philosophy, as contained in your latest book, *Education for Freedom,* I find the following astonishing statements:

> Communism does not reject the mechanization of life; it completes it. It does not deny that economic activity is the principal basis of civilization; it asserts that it is the sole basis. . . . Russian communism is simply the logical prolongation of capitalistic materialism.

The president of a great university has no moral right to make such assertions without adequate proof. *No such proof exists.* Benedetto Croce affirms that all mistakes are of the heart, not of the head—that is to say, mistakes are moral lapses, and there is no excuse for them. Certainly, in your case, there is no excuse for your statements, and you cannot have read any thoughtful, candid, or honest book about Russian communism. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Dean Johnson of the Canterbury cathedral, Albert Rhys Williams, Corliss Lamont, Walter Duranty, Sherwood Eddy, and many others who have written on Russian communism and sovietism, flatly contradict such assertions as you make and produce abundant evidence in refutation of them.

Russian communists work for justice in the economic sphere and realize that without abundance communism is only a vague dream. But they do not say or believe that economic activity is "the sole basis of civilization." On the contrary, they believe, as you do, that intelligence, justice, fraternity, and good will are essential to any genuine civilization. They are educating the masses; they are bringing beauty and nobility into the lives of peasants and workers; they are encouraging and endowing science, the fine arts, social clubs, coöperative cultural societies. *Not one* Russian writer is a materialist; all are idealists and Humanists, and the masters they follow are Gorky, Tolstoy, Dostoevski, Gogol, and Turgeney—all idealists. Lenin wrote much about metaphysics and philosophy; you might read him with advantage.

The writer of this open letter is not a communist. He is an American collectivist of the democratic wing, a libertarian, and a pragmatist in philosophy. He is interested in truth and justice, and he hopes that you, the president of a great university, will publicly withdraw your unfounded assertions concerning the Russian communists, or socialists, and do simple justice to a great people fighting magnificently for civilization in the most comprehensive sense of the term.

La Jolla, California. VICTOR S. YARROS.

Thoughts on India

TO UNITY:

Many times has India, the Mother of millions, been invaded and conquered, and in the end the conquerors have lost their identity.

Many cruel pains have been inflicted on her physical body, but her soul has remained pure and free.

Great foreign dynasties have ruled over her, only to crumble to dust among her magnificent ruins.

Through centuries of political upheavals and military turmoils, the soul of India remains ever fresh, creative, and alive. It is true that her life has been enriched by her contact with other races and peoples, but her soul has never been enslaved.

Her spirit is ever free like the sparkling waters rising and bubbling, eternally renewing her youth and life.

PETER BOIKE.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Humanism and Ethical Culture

To UNITY:

My attention has been called to an article on "Humanism and Moral Leadership," by Edwin H. Wilson, in your February issue. Mr. Wilson takes exception to an essay of mine entitled "Pious Sceptics," which appeared in the November 1942 *Standard*, on the grounds that "by implication this article identified Humanism with rationalism and with 'intellectual arrogance'."

The essay in question does not refer to Humanism but states that scepticism is of two kinds, one (represented by the Rationalist Press Association and the *Arbitrator*) which displays "intellectual arrogance" and another which manifests "a feeling of awe and wonder and mystery about the basic inscrutables of life." Why Mr. Wilson should choose to identify Humanism exclusively with the former of these types is a mystery to me. Can it be that the cap fits? His complaint that my article ought not to have judged Humanism by its lowest denominator is heartening because of the category in which it places the Rationalist Press Association and the *Arbitrator*.

Mr. Wilson appears to be in a hypersensitive frame of mind and to be conjuring up implications which were never intended. My favorable citations of A. E. Haydon are less examples of inconsistency (as Edwin Wilson pretends) than the proof that my article was not designed to condemn Humanism in toto.

Mr. Wilson's slur upon the moral courage of Ethical Culturists comports but ill with his final words about the necessity for an irenic spirit among men of good will.

W. EDWIN COLLIER.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

To UNITY:

It is sporting of Mr. Collier to give me an opportunity to reply to his letter in which he certainly burns me to a crisp. If he finds evidence that the cap fits *me*, I discern indications that the shoe pinches *him*.

The fact that in fifteen years of getting about as a liberal minister and a Humanist, I have not had an opportunity to meet Mr. Collier is indication enough that somebody has been isolated from someone, which is one of the regrettable conditions against which my brief article was directed. Since 1929 we have been publishing humanist material. Some of it has represented the "feeling of awe and wonder and mystery about the basic inscrutables of life" of which he speaks. I recommend particularly the excellent article by humanist James H. Hart, whom the Ethical Culture Society has been astute enough to gather unto its organization: "Religious Mood" (*The New Humanist*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1933). The fact, however, is that in spite of a few amiable contacts with individual leaders, there has been no active or official coöperation with Humanism by the Ethical Societies. My impression, at least, is that to find a time when the Ethical Culture Societies were in fraternal relation with other religious liberals and not offish, one has to hark back to the Free Religious Association. I should like to be proved wrong.

I will stick by my implication that a rationalistic iconoclasm is the lowest common denominator of those who have broken with orthodoxy. But it is not confined to members of the Rationalist Press Association. That organization has numerous important members who are much more than that: Julian Huxley is much more than that; so is Sir Richard Gregory, whose books they publish; and the late F. J. Gould and John A. Hobson, both of whom sought to influence the old guard in the R. P. A. to take "the next step" on to an affirmative Humanism. Anyone who knows William Floyd in recent years knows that he has moved on to something much more than iconoclasm. He has told me personally that he finds inadequate some men of "truth seeker" type, because they are without any faith in humankind. On the other hand there has been rationalism and iconoclasm in many a liberal pulpit and I dare say on many an Ethical platform. Even liberal affirmations imply a negation of the old; in that sense only, I hold rationalism to be "the lowest common denominator." But there is a vast difference between my good friend William Floyd, who I dare say will choose to retain a strong amount of iconoclasm to the end, and, let us say, A. Eustace Haydon and John Dewey. The point of my article is that Humanism at its best deserves the appreciation and coöperation of Unitarian and Ethical Culture officialdom. I sought to issue a warning against the evils of institutionalism, not as a slur, but as one concerned for what I hold to be implicitly a common cause. In a time when the new faith in the common man is coming to the fore, the leadership of such organizations is needed—courageous, forthright, prophetic leadership.

Of course much of the trouble is over labels. Had I been just a little more patient, and seen as I have in the last three months the splendid coöperation of both Unitarian and Ethical leaders with the Conference on the Scientific Spirit and the Democratic Faith, I would never have written that squib. I would have waited to shake hands with Collier at New York, as I trust I shall do before the ink is dry on this issue of UNITY. Although that Conference was initiated by the American Humanist Association, we purposely omitted the humanist label because we wish no barriers to coöperation with men of good will who will stand with us for a democratic ethics and against the authoritarian assault on intelligence wherever it is found. This Conference can, and I trust will, go far to obviate the circumstances that prompted my article.

My reference to Mr. Collier's really splendid article, "Pious Sceptics," was only as a case in point. If it is not a fair case, the dangers of institutionalism against which I warned are still real dangers wherever a vested interest is built up around men or ideas. I fear nothing so much for Humanism as its cult expression, and the possible repetition of errors made by "Churchianity" again and again. I thought I could perceive some of those errors looming in organizations for which I have a great sympathy, and hence I was concerned. Now I am inclined to hope that I was wrong, and rejoice to believe that perhaps I was. But my last word is that there is a responsibility before all religious liberals, to encourage the forward trends among agnostics, rationalists, free thinkers, and to provide a bridge by which they may return to religious fellowship. That cannot be provided by denunciation of them or isolation from them. Far better to seek them out and draw them into active fellowship with men of faith.

EDWIN H. WILSON.

Schenectady, New York.

The Problem of Social Control

To UNITY:

Having read Doctor Holmes' editorial comments in the April issue of UNITY, I cannot refrain from asking how a man who accepts the benefits of organized society, which uses force as the ultimate sanction of social control, and accepts the protection afforded by other men so that he can exercise the privilege of publication and free comment, how accepting all this, he can be inconsistent enough to object to war or naive enough to expect perfection in human leaders?

L. J. CARR.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

I do not "expect perfection in human leaders," but as one trained in the democratic process, I do expect that human leaders shall be subject to criticism. Such criticism involves no implication of infallibility upon the part of the critic, but only a contribution to that free interchange of opinion which is the vindication and glory of the democratic principle. Our free society is in danger the moment that criticism of its leaders is forbidden or even discouraged.

As regards the question as to how I can accept the benefits of organized society, which "uses force as the ultimate sanction of social control," and be "inconsistent enough to object to war," I would say this: Organized society does not use force as the ultimate sanction of its control. On the contrary, as Thomas Jefferson pointed out, in the Declaration of Independence, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Resort to force means the abandonment of social organization and the beginning of chaos. There is no "social control" or direction in this war now raging, but only a mad struggle for power. Such a situation denies to all of us the real "benefits of organized society," and makes us helpless victims of destruction and death. The "ultimate sanction of social control" in this country is the Supreme Court, and I need not point out that the Supreme Court has no power, military, police, or otherwise, to enforce its decisions. All the power that inheres in them derives from public consent. The pacifist who objects to war is the man who would save society from the process of self-destruction.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.